

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present Amendment is responsive to the final Office Action mailed January 25, 2007, in the above-identified application.

Claims 1-22 are the claims currently pending in the application.

New Attorney Docket Number

As an initial matter, a new attorney docket number is provided. This new attorney docket number is 4243-2. The Examiner's cooperation is requested to make the required change for future Office correspondence.

Rejection of Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Accordingly, claim 19 has been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, and is now in independent form. For at least the above-stated reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

(i) with respect to the rejection of claim 19, this claim has been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, for at least the above-stated reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

(ii) with respect to claim 20, this claim has been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. For at least the above-stated reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Culbertson, U.S. Patent No. 5,799,263. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1, as amended, recites, *inter alia*, “determining whether the customer has been picked up; and providing periodic status information to the customer based upon the determination.” In other words, a customer is provided with periodic status information based upon a determination of whether the customer has been picked up.

Culbertson discloses a public transit system for dispatching public transit vehicles based on a cell or zone-based transit system (Culbertson, Abstract), according to which public transit vehicles with outbound routes always start at a centrally located terminal of a cell, and public transit vehicles with inbound routes terminate at the terminal of the cell (Culbertson, column 3, lines 18-23; and column 4, lines 47-55). Culbertson also discloses vehicles that provide intercell service: a passenger is picked up upon request and travels to the terminal of his or her cell, preferably a centrally located terminal of his or her cell, switches to a second vehicle which transports the passenger from the terminal of the first cell to the terminal of the second cell, and then switches to a third vehicle to arrive at the passenger’s ultimate destination (Culbertson, column 6, lines 19-34).

Culbertson does not disclose or suggest “determining whether the customer has been picked up; and providing periodic status information to the customer based upon the determination,” as required by independent claim 1. As discussed, Culbertson discloses a public transit system, in which outbound vehicles transport passengers from the central terminal of the cell, inbound vehicles transport passengers to the central terminal of the cell, and intercell vehicles transport passengers from the central terminal of one cell to the central terminal of a second cell. Thus, Culbertson does not teach, disclose, or suggest determining whether the customer has been picked up and providing periodic status information to the customer based upon the determination, as required by amended claim 1. Therefore, Culbertson does not disclose or suggest the recitations of independent claim 1.

Rejection of Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Culbertson in view of Ayad, U.S. Patent No. 6,756,913. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested. Claim 19 has been amended into independent form and includes similar recitations as those contained in independent claim 1. Accordingly, as Ayad, which teaches a system to dispatch taxis to client locations, does not cure the deficiencies of Culbertson, claim 19 is patentable for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to the rejection of claim 1.

In view of the foregoing discussion, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the application are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present Amendment, or regarding the application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-provided telephone number.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
EFS FILING SYSTEM
ON APRIL 13, 2007

Respectfully submitted,



MAX MOSKOWITZ
Registration No.: 30,576
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700